

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Examiner Choobin is thanked for indicating that Claims 4 and 5 are allowable, and for acknowledgement of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 18, 2001.

Claim 11 is canceled and Claims 13-19 are newly added. Thus, Claims 1-10 and 12-19 are pending, with Claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 being independent.

The Official Action rejects Claims 1-3, 6-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,049,354, hereinafter *Sekine*.

Sekine is directed toward an image shake-correction system with selective image-shake correction. In column 2, lines 40-50 of *Sekine*, it is described that in the case of the image recorded by a domestic video camera, noise or synchronization deviation may occur each time a scene change appears. That is, no correlation between images is obtained when a scene changes and motion detection errors occur, thereby producing instantaneous vibrations in the image that are disagreeable. Basically, when a scene changes, the device determines that severe shaking has occurred and overcompensates.

To remedy the above-noted problem, *Sekine* discloses a shake-correction system that detects scene changes and selectively operates (turns on/off) the shake-correction to avoid the problem of instantaneous vibrations at or around the scene changes.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 10 and 12 are amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter, and now refer to selection of a correction process from among a

plurality of selection processes. *Sekine* does not disclose selection of a correction process from among a plurality of correction processes, and rather discloses a single shake-correction process that is pre-installed and operated intermittently depending on scene change information. For at least those reasons, Claims 1, 7, 9, 10 and 12 are allowable.

In connection with the recitation in original Claim 3 referring to multiple correction processes, the Official Action states that *Sekine* discloses multiple correction processes "motion correction and image shake correction". However, that interpretation of *Sekine* is not correct. In column 3, line 38-40, *Sekine* states that "A third object of the present invention is to vary an image-shake correction characteristic according to an operating mode to optimize motion correction." In column 8, lines 49-50 *Sekine* states that "An image-shake correction system for performing motion correction or image-shake correction on an image signal..." There is no further mention/description in *Sekine* of "motion correction". When read in proper context, it is clear that *Sekine* uses "motion correction" interchangeably with "image-shake correction". It seems that at most, "image-shake correction" is a version of "motion correction". Therefore, *Sekine* does not disclose multiple correction processes as presently referred to in Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 10 and 12.

Should it be maintained that *Sekine* discloses multiple correction processes, it is requested that it be explained in the next Official Action precisely what the differences are between "motion correction" and "image-shake correction" and where or how such are disclosed by *Sekine*.

Claims 2, 3 and 8 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent Claims 1 and 7, and because they include features that

additionally define over the cited documents. For example, Claim 3 defines a storage for storing a plurality of correction processes beforehand. In contrast, as noted above, *Sekine* only includes one process, i.e., shake-correction.

Claims 15-19 recite that the correction process corrects the image in terms of at least one of tone, hue, chroma, contrast and brightness. *Sekine* does not disclose correcting the tone, hue, chroma, contrast or brightness of an image and Claims 15-19 are therefore allowable.

New Claim 13 includes the subject matter of original Claims 1 and 4 which, as indicated in the Official Action, is not disclosed by the cited documents. Therefore, Claim 13 is allowable. Claim 14 is allowable at least because it depends from allowable independent Claim 13.

Based on the remarks above, it is requested that all the rejections be withdrawn and that this application be allowed in a timely manner.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner feel that a teleconference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
(INCLUDING ATTORNEYS FROM BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS)

Date: September 9, 2005

By: Kevin Brayton McGoff
Kevin Brayton McGoff
Registration No. 53297

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620